

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lefort (US 7,019,985). The examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection.

New claims 12-14 have been added above to claim the features recited therein.

Claim 1 has been amended above to clarify applicants' claimed invention. Support for amended claim 1 and new dependent claim 12 can be found in figure 2 which clearly shows a body 21 that has a first side and a second opposing side. It is also clear from figure 2 that the display overlies a first portion of the first side of the body, the key is independently hinged to a second portion of the first side of the body and a portion of the key overlies a third portion of the first side of the body. Figure 2 clearly shows the key region adjacent the display region. Support for new claims 13 and 14 can be found in figure 2 which shows a plurality of hinges associated with a plurality of keys.

Embodiments of the invention relate to an input arrangement for a mobile communication device. The keys are hinged to the body of the device from beneath by a pivot. The pivot supports the keys from beneath and allows the keys to be self supporting. Embodiments of the invention, therefore, allow the keys to be arranged to form a substantially continuous surface and to abut the display of the device.

In the office action, the Examiner has rejected all claims for novelty by citing US 7,019,985 (Lefort).

Lefort relates to an electronic device that includes a display and a keyboard having a fixed part and a movable part. Lefort discloses that an electronic device has a movable part 4 that is hinged to a fixed part 5. The movable part 4 is pivotable about the hinge 7 from an open position to a closed position. The movable part 4 has a number of keys 4A on one side and keys 4C on the opposite side. The fixed part 5 has a number of keys 5A. When the movable part is in the closed position, "the keys 4A and 5A are situated opposite one another and nearly in contact with one another" (col.3, lines 2-4) and are inaccessible to a user. In the closed position only keys 4C are accessible. When the movable part 4 is in the open position, keys 4A and 5A are accessible and keys 4C are inaccessible.

The only disclosure of a hinge mechanism in Lefort is the hinge 7. The hinge 7 hinges the movable part 4 of the keyboard to the fixed part 5. The moveable part 4 of the keyboard is the only component of the device in Lefort that is hinged.

In Lefort, the keys 4A, 4C and 5A are of a conventional design in which a key mat provides user actuatable keys. The keys are supported sideways by a frame which contains apertures co-aligned with the key protrusions. The key protrusions relay user actuation onto co-aligned membrane switches on the surface of a circuit board inside the device. There is nothing disclosed in Lefort to suggest that the keys 4A, 4C and 5A have anything other than this conventional key mat design.

There is no disclosure or suggestion in Lefort of a key being independently hinged to a body. Lefort only discloses a number of keys located on a movable part of a keypad, and the movable part of the keypad being hinged. Therefore, Lefort does not disclose "a key independently hinged to a second portion of the first side of the body" as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is novel over Lefort.

Independent claim 13 recites "a plurality of hinges, each of which hinges a different key". Lefort only discloses a single hinge 7 for hinging movable part 4 to fixed part 5. Therefore, there is no disclosure in Lefort of "a plurality of hinges" as recited in claim 13. Furthermore, there is no disclosure in Lefort of a plurality of keys hinged by plurality of hinges. Therefore, there is no disclosure of "a plurality of hinges, each of which hinges a different key" as recited in claim 13. Independent claim 13 is therefore novel over Lefort.

Independent claim 14 is novel over Lefort for similar reasons to those stated above for independent claims 1 and 13. Independent claim 14 is further novel over Lefort because Lefort fails to disclose or suggest a first key hinged to a body via first hinge and a second key hinged to a body via a second hinge.

There is nothing disclosed or suggested that would motivate a person skilled in the art to modify the teachings of Lefort to provide a key independently hinged to a body. The keys in Lefort are formed from key mat protrusions projecting through co-aligned apertures in a supporting frame. A person skilled

in the art would not modify Lefort to provide a key independently hinged to a body because there is no suggestion that keys with anything other than a conventional key mat design should be used.

Lefort only discloses a single hinge for hinging a movable part of a keypad to a fixed part of a keypad. There is no suggestion that Lefort should be modified to provide a plurality of hinges.

Lefort fails to disclose or suggest even a single key independently hinged and there would be no motivation to provide a plurality hinges, each of which hinges a different key.

Lefort relates to changing the size of a keyboard area available for user actuation, by having keys located on a movable part that is movable from a closed position to an open position. Lefort is not related to improving the structure of keys within a keyboard as in embodiments of the present invention. Therefore, any modification of Lefort to fall within the scope of the claimed invention must be as a result of hindsight. Independent claims 1, 13 and 14 are, therefore, non-obvious in view of Lefort.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.



Appl. No.: 10/813,809
Reply to Office Action of: 06/28/2006

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686)

9/15/06
Date

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

9/15/2006
Date

Clair F. Mann
Name of Person Making Deposit

Appl. No.: 10/813,809
Reply to Office Action of: 06/28/2006

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2

Reference number 22 has been added.